



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/663,390	09/15/2003	Dinei A. Florencio	MCS-032-03 (304924.01)	2920
27662 7590 10/30/2008 MICROSOFT CORPORATION C/O LYON & HARR, LLP 300 ESPLANADE DRIVE SUITE 800 OXNARD, CA 93036				
EXAMINER				
LERNER, MARTIN				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2626				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
10/30/2008		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Advisory Action**  
**Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

**Application No.**

10/663,390

**Applicant(s)**

FLORENCIO ET AL.

**Examiner**

MARTIN LERNER

**Art Unit**

2626

***--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --***

THE REPLY FILED 15 October 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**NOTICE OF APPEAL**

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

**AMENDMENTS**

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.  
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  
7. ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  
Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) rejected: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

**AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE**

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).  
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).  
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER**

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet.  
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.  
13. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

/Martin Lerner/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2626

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Applicants present new arguments after final rejection requiring further consideration.

Firstly, Applicants say that Shlomot fails to disclose the limitation of "determining a maximum delay period." However, it should be noted that the independent claims say that the maximum delay period is "based on a current level of the signal buffer". Specifically, Applicants' Specification does not disclose any method to calculate what the maximum delay period is. Applicants' maximum delay period is just a function of the playback rate and how full the buffer is. (A complete consideration of the issue must distinguish from conventional "late loss" methods.) Shlomot discloses a standard playback rate and a slow event when the buffer level is below a threshold. Thus, a time of  $t + 2$  would be a maximum delay period in Figure 4A, where a packet P1 must be output as packet P3 is received, a packet P2 must be output as packet P4 is received, etc. Accordingly, it is maintained that an equivalent "maximum delay period" of  $t + 2$  is disclosed by Shlomot.

Secondly, regarding the stretching step of independent claim 1, it is pointed out that the stretching need not require an analysis of the contents of the signal buffer exceeding the maximum delay period. The stretching step is continued until "any of" (1) receiving the missing data packets and (2) exceeding the maximum delay period. Thus, meeting either of these two conditions is sufficient to stop stretching the signal. Shlomot discloses at least the first of these two conditions by ceasing to stretch the signal when the missing packets are received.

Thirdly, regarding independent claim 8, Applicants argue that the rejection only considers two of the seven limitations of the claims. However, Applicants then go on to point out that the limitations of independent claim 1 are similar to the limitations of independent claim 8, so that it is presumed that the final rejection intended to incorporate the rejection of independent claim 1 into the rejection of independent claim 8. Indeed, Applicants should note that the rejection of independent claim 8 stated that Shlomot disclosed the features "further comprising". Thus, it was intended that similar considerations are applied to reject independent claim 8, as were applied to reject independent claim 1, with the incorporation of the two additional features. Basically, then, independent claims 1 and 8 should stand or fall together.